



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

11.7

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/774,750

02/09/2004

Byong-Gon Lee

51777/P849

6143

23363 7590 06/05/2007
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP
PO BOX 7068
PASADENA, CA 91109-7068

EXAMINER

SANTIAGO, MARICELI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2879

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/05/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/774,750

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Mariceli Santiago

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The Amendment, filed on February 27, 2007, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the instant application.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 21 of copending U.S. application SN 10/807,916, currently allowed. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each as follows. For simplification purposes only those limitations claimed on the applied reference matching the claim in the instant application are shown.

U.S. Application SN 10/774,750	U.S. Application SN 10/807,916
<p data-bbox="185 319 799 1369">Claims 19 recites a field emission display, comprising: a first substrate and a second substrate facing one another and having a predetermined gap therebetween; an electron emission assembly formed on the first substrate for emitting electrons by generating an electric field; an illumination assembly formed on the second substrate for realizing a display of images responsive to electrons emitted from the electron emission assembly; and a grid plate mounted between the first and second substrates and configured to focus the electrons emitted from the electron emission assembly, wherein the grid plate includes protrusions extending from at least one side thereof and a mask section having apertures through which electrons are passed, and wherein the protrusions are formed between the apertures formed in the mask section and extend along first and second directions that are substantially perpendicular to each other to thereby form a lattice pattern.</p> <p data-bbox="185 1423 799 1642">Claim 20 recites wherein cross-sectional area of the protrusions decreases as the protrusions are traversed from a first end closer to the second substrate to a second end closer to the first substrate.</p>	<p data-bbox="824 319 1448 1684">Claim 21 substantially claims a grid plate apparatus for focusing electrons emitted from emitters in a field emission display having a first substrate and a second substrate facing one another with a predetermined gap therebetween, an electron emission assembly formed on the first substrate for emitting electrons, and an illumination assembly formed on the second substrate for displaying images responsive to the electrons, the grid plate apparatus comprising: a grid plate including a mask section having a plurality of apertures in a predetermined pattern such that a respective aperture is locatable over a respective pixel region of the field emission display; and a plurality of supports (i.e., protrusion), each support being mounted in a predetermined non-pixel region between apertures; wherein the predetermined non-pixel region is a lattice pattern between the apertures in the direction cathode electrodes are formed and in the direction gate electrodes are formed, wherein the grid plate is adapted to receive a predetermined external voltage applied to the grid plate to direct the electrons beams through respective apertures toward the second substrate, and wherein the supports taper such that a contacting area of the supports toward the mask section is larger than a contacting area of the supports toward the first substrate.</p>

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-18 are allowed over the prior art of record.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 1, the references of the Prior Art of record fails to teach or suggest the combination of the limitations as set forth in claim 1, and specifically comprising the limitation of the grid plate includes protrusions integrally formed thereon and extending from at least one side thereof, and wherein the protrusions form a barrier configured to receive misdirected electrons of the electrons emitted from the electron emission assembly to prevent the misdirected electrons from hitting an unintended portion of the illumination assembly.

Regarding claims 2-28, claims 2-18 are allowable for the reasons given in claim 1 because of their dependency status from claim 1.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 19 and 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2879

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mariceli Santiago whose telephone number is (571) 272-2464. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Mariceli Santiago
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2879